

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/901,894	FELUCH, PAUL JOHN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John H Le	2863	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John H Le.

(3) Michael P Nghiem.

(2) Attorney Andrew R Hicks.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 May 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

- ① + Applicants argue that Kent does not teach a data collection and control device including data storage memory for operatively connected with an oil/gas well production facility as recited in claims (1, 15, 16)
- + Claim 13 should depend on claim 1.
- + Applicant Tyler does not teach a data collection and control device for storing data and operatively connected to geographically separated oil/gas wells.
- ② Examiner will consider Applicants arguments and update search